

REMARKS

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 3-5 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 12-24 have been added. Thus, claims 1-2, 6-9, and 11-24 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,917,100 issued to Chuah et al. (*Chuah*). Claim 10 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection of this claim is moot. Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 2, and 11 are not anticipated by *Chuah* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

one or more control commands employed by a respective network element to establish and manage one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network;

Claim 11 incorporates similar limitations.

Chuah discusses a system to provide for a handoff feature in a tunneling protocol, allowing a remote user to change a single existing connection from one switching element to another (col. 10, lines 31-34). However, *Chuah* does not teach or disclose one or more control commands employed by a respective network element to establish and manage **one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network**, as recited in claim 1. Thus, *Chuah* fails to teach or disclose at least one limitation found in independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that *Chuah* does not anticipate claims 1 and 11.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claim 2 is not anticipated by *Chuah*.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-7

Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chuah* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,000 issued to Akhtar et al. (*Akhtar*). Claims 3-5 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-7 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Akhtar* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 6-7 depend from independent claim 1 and necessarily include the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Chuah* fails to teach or disclose one or more control commands employed by a respective network element to establish and manage **one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network**. *Akhtar* is cited as disclosing that an IPM-L2-Address AVP carries the L2-Address of an IPM Client connection and that an Integrity-Check Value AVP is used for hop-by-hop message authentication and integrity. Whether or not *Akhtar* actually teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, *Akhtar* does not teach or disclose one or more control commands selectively employed to establish and manage one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network. Thus, *Akhtar* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chuah*. Therefore,

Applicant submits that claims 3-7 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Akhtar*.

Claims 8 and 9

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chuah* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,915,345 issued to Tummala et al. (*Tummala*).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-9 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Tummala* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and necessarily include the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Chuah* fails to teach or disclose one or more control commands employed by a respective network element to establish and manage **one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network**. *Tummala* is cited as disclosing that encryption can be made using a shared secret or public keys. Whether or not *Tummala* actually teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, *Tummala* does not teach or disclose one or more control commands selectively employed to establish and manage one or more simultaneous wireless communication sessions of a single end-user terminal in a data network. Thus, *Tummala* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chuah*. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3-7 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Tummala*.

New Claims

Claims 12-24 have been added. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits claims 12-14 are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 15 is an independent claim incorporating the limitations of canceled claim 3. Claim 20 recites similar limitations. Applicant agrees with the Office action that

Chuah does not teach or disclose an attribute-value pair for each of a deterministic element and a random element. The Office action cites *Akhtar* as disclosing the deficient limitations.

The Office action states that *Akhtar* teaches that an IPM-L2-Address AVP carries the L2-Address and data (column 84, lines 15-20), but says nothing regarding an AVP for each of a deterministic element and a random element. There is no indication in *Akhtar* that the IPM-L2-Address AVP includes a deterministic or a random element. Thus, whether or not *Akhtar* teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, Applicant submits *Akhtar* does not teach or disclose an attribute-value pair for each of a deterministic element and a random element, as claimed by Applicant. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 20 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Akhtar*.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. Claims 21-24 depend from claim 20. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-19 and 21-24 are not obvious in view of *Chuah* and *Akhtar*.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account
number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 11/4/05



Gregory D. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,926

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778